

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the preceding amendments and following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-15, 17-20, 22-24, 26-28 and 30-32 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 12-15 are amended and no claims have been are cancelled. No new matter is added. Claims 1, 12, 13, 14, and 15 are the independent claims. Example support for the amendments herein may be found at Para. [0033-0039] and Figs. 2-6 of the present application.

Examiner Interview

Initially, Applicants wish to thank Examiner Chio for his time and helpful comments during the telephonic interview of February 24, 2010. During the interview, Applicants explained in detail example embodiments of the present application in view of the claims and the cited art. Upon gaining a clearer understanding of the limitations of claim 1, the Examiner agreed that US 2001/00130710 A1 ("Werner") failed to disclose the following limitations of claim 1:

the first and second segments including **identifiers** identifying the first and second **segments**, respectively, and the second segment being **linked** to the first segment;

the global style information included in the first segment is **separate** from the text subtitle data included in the second segment and the local style information forms a **group** with the text subtitle data included in the second segment; and

the local style information includes the font information for the text subtitle data recorded **sequentially** after the local style information.

During the interview, Applicants also discussed with the Examiner that the “global style information” applies to the entire “region” while the “local style information” only applies to the “text subtitle data,” where the “region” includes at least the “text subtitle data.” The Examiner stated that he would have to examine this feature more closely.

Regarding, the 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection, the Examiner suggested inserting the language “non-transitory” before “computer readable medium” to overcome this rejection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-4, 6 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the language “non-transitory,” according to the Examiner’s suggestion. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-6, 8, 9, 12-15, 17-20, 22-24, 26-28 and 30-32

Claims 1-6, 8, 9, 12-15, 17-20, 22-24, 26-28 and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,046,778 (“Nonomura”) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/00130710A1 (“Werner”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons detailed below.

For at least the reasons summarized above and discussed in the Examiner interview, claim 1 is patentable over Werner. Further, Applicants note that claim 1 recites *inter alia*, “the **global style information** including at least one of composition information and rendering information **for a region including the text subtitle data**,

and the **local style information** including at least one font information for the **text subtitle data.**” The Examiner relies on the “display attribute file 11” in Fig. 1 of Nonomura to disclose the “global style information” of claim 1 and the “outline font file 10” in Fig. 1 of Nonomura to disclose the “local style information” of claim 1. The Examiner also generally relies upon FIGS. 5A-5B to disclose the above limitation of claim 1. Initially, Applicants note that Col. 5, Ln. 47-51 of Nonomura discloses that the “the display attribute file 11 is used for calculating a display position of each subtitle image.” Further, Col. 5, Ln. 65-67 of Nonomura disclose that the “outline font file 10 includes outline fonts (vector fonts) in which an outline of each character is shown.” Therefore, as the “display attribute file 11” only relates to a position of the subtitle image” while the “outline font file 10” only relates to the font information of characters, the information of the “display attribute file 11” does not apply to a region that includes the “characters” in Nonomura. As such, Nonomura fails to disclose “the **global style information** including at least one of composition information and rendering information **for a region including the text subtitle data**, and the **local style information** including at least one font information for the **text subtitle data**,” as recited in claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons amended claim 1 is patentable over Nonomura and Werner. Even assuming *arguendo* that Nonomura and Werner are combinable (which Applicants do not admit), Werner still fails to remedy the deficiencies of Nonomura with respect to amended claim 1. Amended independent claims 12-15 are at least somewhat similar to amended claim 1 and therefore patentable for at least somewhat similar reasons. Dependent claims 2-6, 8, 9, 17-20, 22-24, 26-28 and 30-32

are at least patentable by virtue of their dependency on one of amended independent claims 1 and 12-15. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the rejection to the above claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 10 and 11

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,046,778 ("Nonomura") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/00130710A1 ("Werner") as applied to claim 1, and furthering view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0087999A1 ("Kashima").

Even assuming *arguendo* that Nonomura and Werner are combinable (which Applicants do not admit), Werner still fails to remedy the deficiencies of Nonomura with respect to claim 1. Dependent claims 10-11 are at least patentable by virtue of their dependency on independent claim 1. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the rejection to the above claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks and amendments, the Applicants respectfully submit that each of the pending objections and rejections has been addressed and overcome, placing the present application in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Gary D. Yacura, at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By



Gary D. Yacura, Reg. No. 35,416
Neel Patel, Reg. No. 59,452
P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

GDY/NKP:cfc

N